

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. 10/03/2003 Shomir Ghosh 1855.2044-001 1269 10/678,872 EXAMINER 02/22/2006 30405 SEAMAN, D MARGARET M MILLENNIUM PHARMACEUTICALS, INC. 40 Landsdowne Street PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT CAMBRIDGE, MA 02139 1625

DATE MAILED: 02/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/678,872	GHOSH ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	D. Margaret Seaman	1625
- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address - Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
 Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>28 December 2005</u>. This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i>, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. 		
Disposition of Claims		
4) Claim(s) 25-44 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 25-44 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or compared to the specification is objected to by the Examine	over election requirement.	
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated and acc	cepted or b) objected to by the E drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec ction is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). lected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 		
Attachment(s)	4) Interview Summary	(DTO 412)
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	Paper No(s)/Mail Da	

Application/Control Number: 10/678,872 Page 2

Art Unit: 1625

DETAILED ACTION

This application was filed 10/03/2003 and claims priority to Provisional Application 60/416501 (10/4/2002). Claims 1-24 were canceled by paper dated 12/28/2005. Claims 25-44 are before the Examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:
 - 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 - 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 - 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 - 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
- 3. Claims 25-38 and 40-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) and being obvious over Zalukajevs (CA 48:56687, CA 62:22149, CA 59:54789, 67:53250 and CA 65:15179e-g) and Funabashi (CA 72:31075).

Application/Control Number: 10/678,872 Page 3

Art Unit: 1625

Zalukajevs and Funabashi both teach 4-anilino-1-benzoyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydroquinaldine that are encompassed by the instant markush of claim 25.

Zalukajevs teaches N-(1-benzoyl-1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-2-methyl-4-quinolinyl)-N-phenyl-acetamide or a N-(1-benzoyl-6-(Cl or Br)-1,2,3,4-tetrahydro-2-methyl-4-quinolinyl)-N-phenyl-acetamide.

The difference between the compounds taught by Zalukajevs and Funabashi and the instantly claimed compounds is that the compounds of the prior art are hydrogen analogues of the instantly claimed compounds (because the compounds specifically disclosed by the prior art are provisoed out by the lengthy proviso of claim 25).

However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to make a hydrogen analog compound of the compounds taught by Zalukajevs and Funabashi with the reasonable expectation of getting a compounds having activity against allergic diseases/conditions. Rationale: Zalukajevs and Funabashi all teach the desirability of the compounds and the ability to make a hydrogen analog of a known compound having known utility is well within the skill of the ordinary artisan.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Page 4

5. Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, claim 39 is ambiguous due to the structures given in the claim are so small that the actual identity of the compound being claimed is unclear. It is suggested that the claim be amended such that the size of the structures being claimed is large enough that the bonds and atoms are clearly evident.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to D. Margaret Seaman whose telephone number is 571-272-0694. The examiner can normally be reached on 730am-4pm, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cecelia Tsang can be reached on 571-272-0562. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 1625

D. Margaret Seaman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1625

dms